



Contractor Performance Assessment Review Services/IT/Operations Support (CPARS) Form

Evaluation of Performance (Source Selection Information) (See FAR 42.15 and NFS 1842.15)

CONTRACT/PO NO.	<input type="checkbox"/>	INITIAL	CONTRACTOR	EVALUATION PERIOD	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	INTERMEDIATE			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	FINAL			
A. Quality of Product or Service (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	2. Marginal <input type="checkbox"/>	3. Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	4. Very Good <input type="checkbox"/>	5. Exceptional <input type="checkbox"/>
B. Schedule (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	2. Marginal <input type="checkbox"/>	3. Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	4. Very Good <input type="checkbox"/>	5. Exceptional <input type="checkbox"/>
C. Cost Control (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	2. Marginal <input type="checkbox"/>	3. Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	4. Very Good <input type="checkbox"/>	5. Exceptional <input type="checkbox"/>
D. Business Relations (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	2. Marginal <input type="checkbox"/>	3. Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	4. Very Good <input type="checkbox"/>	5. Exceptional <input type="checkbox"/>
E. Management of Key Personnel (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	2. Marginal <input type="checkbox"/>	3. Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	4. Very Good <input type="checkbox"/>	5. Exceptional <input type="checkbox"/>
F. Other Areas (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	2. Marginal <input type="checkbox"/>	3. Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	4. Very Good <input type="checkbox"/>	5. Exceptional <input type="checkbox"/>

G. Evaluator Statement

Given what I know today about the contractor's ability to execute what they promised in their proposal,

I (check one) ☐ definitely would not, ☐ probably would not, ☐ might or might not, ☐ probably would or

☐ definitely would award to them today, given that I had a choice.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING A SERVICES/IT/OPERATIONS SUPPORT CPARS FORM

Each area assessment must be based on objective data. Facts to support specific areas of evaluation must be requested from the contracting officer and other government specialists familiar with the contractor's performance on the contract under review. Such specialists may, for example, be from engineering, manufacturing, quality, logistics (including provisioning), contract administration services, maintenance, security, data, etc.

The amount of risk inherent in the effort should be recognized as a significant factor and taken into account when assessing the contractor's performance. When a contractor identifies significant technical risk and takes action to abate those risks, the effectiveness of these actions should be included in the narrative supporting the ratings from the specific area being evaluated.

The CPAR is designed to assess prime contractor performance. However, in those evaluation areas where subcontractor actions have significantly influenced the prime contractor's performance in a negative or positive way, record the subcontractor actions with the COTR/Technical Rep/Program Manager narrative.

Evaluate all areas that pertain to the contract under evaluation, unless they are not applicable – N/A.

When performance has changed from one period to another such that a change in rating results, the COTR/Technical Rep/Program Manager narrative must address each change.

The COTR/Technical Rep/Program Manager should use customary industry quantitative measures where they are applicable if the contract is for commercial products.

RATINGS WILL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEFINITIONS DESCRIBED BELOW.

Exceptional. Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.

*NOTE: To justify an **Exceptional** rating, you should identify multiple significant events in each category and state how it was a benefit to the GOVERNMENT. However, a singular event could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.*

Very Good. Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions were effective.

*NOTE: To justify a **Very Good** rating, you should identify a significant event in each category and state how it was a benefit to the GOVERNMENT. Also there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.*

Satisfactory. Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.

*NOTE: To justify a **Satisfactory** rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract. Also there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.*

Marginal. Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.

*NOTE: To justify **Marginal** performance, you should identify a significant event in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the GOVERNMENT. A **Marginal** rating should be supported by referencing the management tool that notified the contractor of the contractual deficiency (e.g. Management, Quality, Safety or Environmental Deficiency Report or letter).*

Unsatisfactory. Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.

*NOTE: To justify an **Unsatisfactory** rating, you should identify multiple significant events in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the GOVERNMENT. However, a singular problem could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating. An **Unsatisfactory** rating should be supported by referencing the management tools used to notify the contractor of the contractual deficiencies (e.g. Management, Quality, Safety or Environment Deficiency Reports, or letters).*

COTR/Technical Rep/Program Manager Narrative. A short, factual narrative statement is required for all assessments regardless of rating. Cross-reference the comments in this block to their corresponding evaluation area listed above. Each narrative statement in support of the area assessment must contain objective data. An exceptional cost performance assessment could, for example, cite the current underrun dollar value and estimate at completion. A marginal assessment could, for example, be supported by information concerning personnel changes or schedule delinquency rate. Key personnel familiar with the effort may have been replaced by less experienced personnel. Sources of data may include customer/field surveys or evaluation of contractor reports.

EVALUATION AREAS

A. Quality of Product or Service. Assess the contractor's conformance to contract requirements, specifications and standards of good workmanship (e.g., commonly accepted technical, professional, environmental, or safety and health standards).

For example: Are reports/data accurate? Does the product or service provided meet the specifications of the contract? Does the contractor's work measure up to commonly accepted technical or professional standards? Assess the degree of Government technical direction required to solve problems that arise during performance.

For Operations Support: Assess how successfully the contractor meets program quality objectives such as producibility, reliability, maintainability and inspectability. The evaluator must be flexible in how contract success is measured; e.g., using data from field reliability and maintainability and failure reports, user comments and acceptance rates, and scrap and rework rates. These quantitative indicators may be useful later, for example, in source selection evaluations, in demonstrating continuous improvement, quality and reliability leadership that reflects progress in total quality management. Assess the contractor's control of the overall production process to include material control, shop planning and control, and statusing.

B. Schedule. Assess the timeliness of the contractor against the completion of the contract, task orders, milestones, delivery schedules, administrative requirements (e.g., efforts that contribute to or effect the schedule variance).

This assessment of the contractor's adherence to the required delivery schedule should include the contractor's efforts during the assessment period that contribute to or effect the schedule variance. This element applies to contract closeout activities as well as contract performance. Instances of adverse actions such as the assessment of liquidated damages, or issuance of Cure Notices, Show Cause Notices, and Delinquency Notices are indicators of problems which may have resulted in variance to the contract schedule and should therefore be noted in the evaluation.

C. Cost Control. (Not required for Firm Fixed Price or Firm Fixed Price with Economic Price Adjustment). Assess the contractor's effectiveness in forecasting, managing, and controlling contract cost.

For example, does the contractor keep within the total estimated cost (what is the relationship of the negotiated costs and budgeted costs to actual)? Did the contractor do anything innovative that resulted in cost savings? Were billings current, accurate and complete? Are the contractor's budgetary internal controls adequate?

D. Business Relations. Assess the integration and coordination of all activity needed to execute the contract, specifically the timeliness, completeness and quality of problem identification, corrective action plans, proposal submittals, the contractor's history of reasonable and cooperative behavior, customer satisfaction, timely award and management of subcontracts, and whether the contractor met small/small disadvantaged and women-owned business participation goals.

Is the contractor oriented toward the customer? Is interaction between the contractor and the government satisfactory, or does it need improvement? Timely award and management of subcontractors should include subcontract costs and problem resolution. Also, in making the assessment, include the adequacy of the contractor's accounting, billing, and estimating systems; and the contractor's management of government Property (GFP), if a substantial amount of GFP has been provided to the contractor under the contract.

E. Management of Key Personnel (For Services and Information Technology Business Sectors only - Not Applicable to Operations Support). Assess the contractor's performance in selecting, retaining, supporting, and replacing, when necessary, key personnel.

For example, how well did the contractor match the qualifications of the key position, as described in the contract, with the person who filled the key position? Did the contractor support key personnel so they were able to work effectively? If a key person did not perform well, what action was taken by the contractor to correct this? If a replacement of a key person was necessary, did the replacement meet or exceed the qualifications of the position as described in the contract schedule?

F. Other Areas. Specify additional evaluation areas that are unique to the contract, or that cannot be captured elsewhere on the form. More than one type of entry may be included, but should be separately labeled.

G. Evaluator Statement. Check the statement that best applies to the contract evaluation.

NARRATIVES GUIDELINES

- Address contractor performance: Recent, Relevant
- Collect input from entire program/project team
- Provide reader a complete understanding of contractor's performance
- Narrative required for each rated element
- Address: Rating changes from prior reports, Benefit/impact to Government
- Recognize: Risk inherent in effort, Government's role in contractor's inability to meet requirements
- Indicate major/minor strengths/weaknesses
- Consistent with: Program metrics, Ratings, Contract objectives
- Document problems and solutions
- Contain nonpersonal and objective statements

Below are samples of narratives.

NOT Sufficient

Quality – Rating: Exceptional

The contractor is exceptional. They continually provide high-quality training and services.

The above narrative is missing details to support rating; details to tell entire story; supporting documentation/metrics.

Sufficient

Quality – Rating: Exceptional

Contractor has provided exceptional quality to our 40 worldwide locations during this reporting period. For example, ST requirements were changed and Contractor adjusted to providing 15 training sessions per month versus 10 without additional cost through use of an "express setup" module that requires less instructor preparation time. This allowed users to be trained 3 months more quickly than required. The contractor also aggressively represented the government's interest in dealing with their vendor to correct a system software malfunction. They worked with the vendor to revise the terms and conditions of the warranty clause to correct errors with no cost to the government. They also implemented a new risk management system that reduced potential risk actions by 50%. This also saved the government considerable stress and ensured a constant throughput of aircrew members trained.

NOT Sufficient

Quality – Rating: Very Good

In our opinion, the contractor has done really well in terms of schedule. The Training Manager, Jack Jones, is pleasant and easy to work with. He adapts to our schedule changes amazingly and never complains. He also went above and beyond and fixed our printer and fax without charging the government and he continued to meet all the contract objectives in the interim. Great job!

The above narrative is missing details to support rating; supporting documentation/metrics; used individual's name; work is outside the contract scope; subjective phrases.

Statements to Avoid "Outside Contract Scope" "In Our Opinion" "It Appeared" "We Believe" "We Hope" "We Were Not Happy" "We Did Not Like" "We Think"